

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Again, applicants thank the Examiner for her Office Action dated July 30, 2003. Claims 1-15 and Claim 17 are currently pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance are hereby requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 112, second paragraph. The applicants cancel Claim 16.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-15 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stevenson* (USPN 6,209,112) in view of *Computer Dictionary (Microsoft Press, 2d Ed.)* (“*Dictionary*”). The office action submits that the cited references teach Claim 8:

“A method of decoding an encoded message received over an interconnect link in a network, the method comprising:

receiving an encoded data packet comprising having a received CRC segment and a payload segment;

calculating a first CRC value using the payload segment;

decoding the first CRC using a plurality of inversion bits;

decoding the received CRC using the plurality of inversion bits;

comparing the first CRC and the received CRC thereby determining whether the encoded message was received with any errors”

The Applicants do not believe that the cited references teach all of the claim limitations of **Claim 8**. The Office Action states that *Stevenson* fails to teach or suggest the limitation of “decoding the received CRC using the plurality of inversion bits”. The Applicants agree with the Examiner on this point. However, the Applicants respectfully assert that the *Dictionary* does not teach “decoding the received CRC using the plurality of inversion bits”. Nowhere in the *Dictionary* is this application of inversion bits taught. A used in the *Dictionary* the term decoding is so broad that it cannot be said to teach any particular invention at all. One of ordinary skill could not take the *Stevenson* and the *Dictionary* and make the obvious conclusion that the claimed invention is the result. Because, the cited art fails to teach or suggest decoding a received CRC using the plurality of inversion bits, the cited art fails to establish a prima facie

case of obviousness. Thus, it is respectfully, submitted that the rejection of Claim 8 (and the dependent Claims 9-15 & 17) be withdrawn.

Concerning **Claim 9**, for at least the same reasons as asserted above with respect to Claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claim 9 also be withdrawn. Moreover, the applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach the limitations of “removing the plurality of inversion bits from the encoded message”. Thus, for this additional reason, the applicants submit that the combination of cited references fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness regarding Claim 9. Therefore, the applicants request that this ground for rejection be withdrawn.

As for **Claims 10 & 13**, for at least the same reasons as asserted above with respect to Claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claims 10 & 13 also be withdrawn. Moreover, the applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach the limitations of determining the type of error in a message. For example, the cited art does not teach or suggest “determining whether an error in the encoded message resulted from a transmission error” (as in Claim 10). Also, the cited art does not teach or suggest “determining whether an error in the encoded message resulted from a non-transmission error” (as in Claim 13). These subtleties of error detection go well beyond anything taught or suggested by the cited references. Thus, for these additional reasons, the applicants submit that the combination of cited references fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness regarding Claims 10 & 13. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that this ground for rejection be withdrawn.

As for **Claims 11 & 12**, for at least the same reasons as asserted above with respect to Claims 8 and 11, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claims 11-12 also be withdrawn. Moreover, the applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach the limitations of “comparing a first plurality of preselected bits in the received CRC with a second plurality of preselected bits in the first CRC” (Claim 11). None of the advantages of using only some of the CRC bits is taught or suggested in any of the cited references. Such selectivity can enable specific error types to be discerned. This is simply not addressed at all in the cited art. This distinction from the cited art is further magnified in Claim 12 where “both the first plurality of preselected bits and the second plurality of preselected bits have the same bit positions”. There is no such teaching or suggestion of this limitation either. Thus, for these additional reasons, the applicants submit that the combination of cited references fails to

establish a prima facie case of obviousness regarding Claims 11-12. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that this ground for rejection be withdrawn.

As for **Claims 14-15**, for at least the same reasons as asserted above with respect to Claims 8 and 13, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claims 14-15 also be withdrawn. Moreover, the applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach the limitations of “comparing a third plurality of preselected bits in the received CRC with a fourth plurality of preselected bits in the first CRC” (Claim 14). None of the advantages of using only some of the CRC bits is taught or suggested in any of the cited references. Such selectivity can enable specific error types to be discerned. This is simply not addressed at all in the cited art. This distinction from the cited art is also present in Claim 15 where “both the third plurality of preselected bits in the received CRC and the fourth plurality of preselected bits in the fourth plurality of preselected bits have the same bit positions”. There is no such teaching or suggestion of this limitation either. Thus, for these additional reasons, the applicants submit that the combination of cited references fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness regarding Claims 14-15. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that this ground for rejection be withdrawn.

As discussed above, **Claim 16** is withdrawn.

Concerning **Claim 17**, for at least the same reasons as asserted above with respect to Claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claim 17 also be withdrawn. Moreover, the applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach the limitations of a “first CRC and the received CRC have 30 bits wherein the 30 bits includes a CRC value for a sequence number”. Thus, for this additional reason, the applicants submit that the combination of cited references fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness regarding Claim 17. Therefore, the applicants request that this ground for rejection be withdrawn.

Thus, the applicant respectfully assert that the invention claimed in **Claims 8-15 and 17** are significantly different than that taught or suggested in the cited art. The Applicants respectfully request, that for the reasons advanced hereinabove, that the pending rejections of these claims be withdrawn. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 8-15 and 17 at this time.

Allowed Subject Matter

The applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of Claims 1-7.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention as presently presented is patentable over the art of record and that this case is now in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner, for any reason, wish to contact the undersigned, she is cordially invited to do so at her convenience. Moreover, if the Examiner has any continuing concerns regarding this case, she is invited to contact the undersigned at (831) 655-2300.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "F. T. Kalinski II", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Francis T. Kalinski II
Reg. No. 44,177

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(831) 655-2300